Interview Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/207,188

Blake et al.

Examiner

S. Devi, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit 1645

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):
(1) S. Devi (PTO)	(3) <u>Darryl Steensma</u>
(2) Ken Sonnenfeld	(4) Lynette Smith
Date of Interview May 17, 2001	_
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🔀 No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: All of record.	
Identification of prior art discussed:	
Mr. Sonnenfeld stated that the parent case was allowed we et al. was applied in the parent case under 35 USC 102 and that it was improper to object to the same claim language.	nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or with the language "about 3" in the claim. He stated that Reimer and was later withdrawn by the previous Examiner. He stated in a Divisonal application. He was told that each case is rent case would be ordered for a review of the prosecution by discussed with other officials in the Office if needed. Mr
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORM, INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPI	ate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). AL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST EP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has

5 Joyal

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.